



Published in final edited form as:

ACS Catal. 2018 December 7; 8(12): 11741–11748. doi:10.1021/acscatal.8b04094.

Visible-Light-Induced, Copper-Catalyzed Three-Component Coupling of Alkyl Halides, Olefins, and Trifluoromethylthiolate to Generate Trifluoromethyl Thioethers

Jian He, Caiyou Chen, Gregory C. Fu, Jonas C. Peters

Division of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, United States

Abstract

Photoinduced, copper-catalyzed coupling reactions are emerging as a powerful method for generating $\text{Csp}^3\text{--Y}$ ($\text{Y} = \text{C}$ or heteroatom) bonds from alkyl electrophiles and nucleophiles. Corresponding *three*-component couplings of alkyl electrophiles, *olefins*, and nucleophiles have the potential to generate an additional $\text{Csp}^3\text{--Y}$ bond and to efficiently add functional groups to both carbons of an olefin, which serves as a readily available linchpin. In this report, we establish that a variety of electrophiles and a trifluoromethylthiolate nucleophile can add across an array of olefins (including styrenes and electron-poor olefins) in the presence of CuI/binap and blue-LED irradiation, thereby generating trifluoromethyl thioethers in good yield. The process tolerates a wide range of functional groups, and an initial survey of other nucleophiles (i.e., bromide, cyanide, and azide) suggests that this three-component coupling strategy is versatile. Mechanistic studies are consistent with a photoexcited $\text{Cu(I)}/\text{binap}/\text{SCF}_3$ complex serving as a reductant to generate an alkyl radical from the electrophile, which likely reacts in turn with the olefin and a $\text{Cu(II)}/\text{SCF}_3$ complex to afford the coupling product.

Graphical Abstract



Corresponding Authors: jpeters@caltech.edu, gcfu@caltech.edu.

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the [ACS Publications website](#) at DOI: Procedures and characterization data (PDF)

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

INTRODUCTION

Because of its high lipophilicity and electron-withdrawing nature,¹ the incorporation of an SCF₃ group into bioactive molecules (see Figure 1) can significantly alter their pharmacokinetic and physicochemical properties.^{2,3} While C–H functionalization,⁴ radical addition,⁵ and electrophilic substitution^{6,7} can be exploited to construct C–SCF₃ bonds, the toxicity of gaseous CF₃SCl and the multi-step routes needed to access certain other electrophilic SCF₃ reagents can be an impediment to such approaches.⁸ Consequently, the incorporation of an SCF₃ group through the use of an SCF₃ nucleophile is attractive, e.g., through an S_N2 reaction with an alkyl electrophile.^{9–10,11}

We have recently reported that cross-couplings of a variety of nucleophiles with organic electrophiles can be achieved under mild conditions (–40 to 30 °C) in the presence of light and a copper catalyst.^{12–13,14,15} In one of the simplest mechanistic scenarios that we have considered, an organic radical (R•), generated through electron transfer from a photoexcited copper(I)–nucleophile adduct (**B**) to the electrophile, reacts with a copper(II)–nucleophile complex to yield the cross-coupling product (top of Figure 2, **C**→**D**).¹⁶ We have established that, in at least some photoinduced, copper-catalyzed couplings, bond formation occurs after cage escape of the radicals.¹⁷

We have been interested in further enhancing the scope and the utility of photoinduced, copper-catalyzed coupling reactions, e.g., by creating two new bonds in the process, rather than one. For example, we speculated that it might be possible to intercept the organic radical (R•) with an olefin, prior to C–Nu bond formation (bottom of Figure 2). If the resulting radical (R'•) were subsequently trapped by a Cu(II)–nucleophile complex (**C**), then a three-component coupling would be achieved. Among the potential impediments to the success of such a process are direct substitution of the alkyl electrophile by the nucleophile (either via an S_N2 reaction or via the pathway illustrated at the top of Figure 2) and olefin polymerization.¹⁸

It is important to note that there are several recent reports of copper-catalyzed three-component couplings of alkyl halides, olefins, and nucleophiles, both thermally (>80 °C)¹⁹ and photochemically induced,²⁰ although none employ SCF₃ as a nucleophile.^{21,22} The photoinduced processes are limited to the use of perfluoroalkyl iodides as electrophiles and employ high-energy ultraviolet irradiation (254 nm),²⁰ conditions under which the C–I bond of the electrophile may undergo direct homolysis.²³ Additionally, prior photoinduced, three-component couplings with alkyl electrophiles have generally employed monosubstituted olefins as substrates; there is a single reported example using a 1,2-disubstituted olefin (the cyanofluoroalkylation of *trans*-β-methylstyrene).^{20a}

In this report, we establish that copper-catalyzed three-component couplings of an array of alkyl halides and olefins with trifluoromethylthiolate can be achieved under mild conditions (r.t. or below; blue-LED irradiation) to generate functionalized trifluoromethyl thioethers in good yield (eq 1). The scope with respect to the alkyl electrophile and the olefin compares favorably with previous studies of copper-catalyzed three-component couplings.²⁰



(1)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Upon surveying an array of reaction parameters, we identified a procedure that achieves the desired three-component coupling (Table 1, entry 1; 82% yield). Control experiments establish the importance of CuI, binap, and light (entries 2–4); notably, essentially none of the target product is observed in the absence of light even at 80 °C (entry 5). Irradiation at 350 or 300 nm, rather than with blue LED, leads to significantly less-efficient coupling (entries 6 and 7). A variety of Cu(I) and Cu(II) sources provide the desired product in fairly good yield (entries 8–10), whereas copper nanoparticles do not (entry 11). Replacement of binap with several other phosphines, as well as 1,10-phenanthroline, leads to little desired product (entries 12–16), and commonly used iridium and ruthenium photocatalysts²⁴ are relatively ineffective (entries 17 and 18). The three-component coupling proceeds somewhat less efficiently with less binap (entry 19), less CuI/binap (entry 20; no further reaction after 24 h), and less electrophile/NMe₄SCF₃ (entry 21). Although the coupling cannot be conducted under an atmosphere of air (entry 22), it is not highly water-sensitive (entry 23).

This photoinduced, copper-catalyzed three-component coupling is effective for a variety of olefins (Table 2). For example, terminal olefins that bear an alkyl, aryl, or carbonyl group engage in the coupling in good yield (entries 1–9); in the case of benzyl acrylate, conjugate addition of thiolate can be avoided by conducting the reaction at –10 °C. Importantly, the method is not limited to couplings of terminal olefins: 1,1- and 1,2-disubstituted olefins, as well as a trisubstituted olefin, are also suitable reaction partners (entries 10–14); it is noteworthy that, for the couplings that generate diastereomers, the stereoselectivity is high (> 10:1; entries 13 and 14). The method can be applied to a more complex substrate derived from estrone, giving the desired product in excellent yield (entry 15). On a gram-scale, the three-component coupling illustrated in entry 8 proceeds in 82% yield.

The scope with respect to the alkyl halide is also fairly broad (Table 3). Thus, a variety of α -bromocarbonyl compounds, including primary, secondary, and tertiary electrophiles, participate in the three-component coupling (entries 1–8). Because of the high nucleophilicity of trifluoromethylthiolate and the high electrophilicity of primary and secondary α -bromocarbonyl compounds, three-component reactions of the latter were conducted at low temperature (–40 to –10 °C) in order to disfavor direct S_N2 reactions (entries 1–6);^{9b} of course, this solution would not be available in the case of thermal (vs. photochemical) copper-catalyzed three-component couplings.

This method is not limited to the use of α -bromocarbonyl compounds as electrophilic coupling partners: perhalogenated electrophiles (Table 3, entries 9–11), 2-iodo-1,1,1-trifluoroethane (entry 12), and an α -bromosulfone (entry 13) also participate in the three-component coupling, providing very good yields of the desired trifluoromethyl thioethers (entries 9–13). On the other hand, our standard conditions are not effective for the coupling of an unfunctionalized alkyl halide.

With regard to the functional-group tolerance of this photoinduced, copper-catalyzed three-component coupling, the examples provided in Tables 2 and 3 demonstrate compatibility with esters, ethers, carbamates, amides, ketones, and sulfones. We have further examined the functional-group compatibility of this method by carrying out the model reaction in the presence of various additives (Table 4).²⁵ Thus, with a wide range of additives, the three-component coupling proceeds with little or no impact on the yield of the desired product or on the additive (top of Table 4). In the case of a benzofuran, a secondary alcohol, and an aldehyde, the yield of the desired product is also largely unaffected, and most, but not all, of the additive is recovered (middle of Table 4). In contrast, the three-component coupling is inhibited somewhat by the presence of an indole, an *N*-alkyl aniline, and a secondary amine, and the additive is partly or entirely consumed (bottom of Table 4).

From the outset, as schematically outlined at the bottom of Figure 2, our longer-term objective has been to develop photoinduced, copper-catalyzed three-component couplings of electrophiles, olefins, and nucleophiles into a general strategy for the convergent synthesis of functionalized organic compounds under mild conditions. We therefore regard it as significant that the method that we have developed for trifluoromethylthiolation can be applied directly to three-component couplings that utilize other nucleophiles (Table 5). Thus, under the same conditions, bromide, cyanide, and azide serve as suitable nucleophiles, furnishing the target compounds in promising yield (Table 5).²⁶ These initial observations provide a strong impetus for further reaction-development efforts in this area.

With regard to the mechanism of the photoinduced, copper-catalyzed three-component coupling to form trifluoromethyl thioethers, Figure 2 (bottom) provides an outline of one of the pathways that we have considered.²⁷ In this mechanistic scenario, $[L_n(\text{binap})\text{Cu}^{\text{I}}(\text{SCF}_3)]$ may serve as compound **A**, undergoing photoexcitation to generate $[L_n(\text{binap})\text{Cu}^{\text{I}}(\text{SCF}_3)]^*$ (**B**). This intermediate engages in electron transfer with the alkyl halide, providing $[L_n(\text{binap})\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}(\text{SCF}_3)]$ (**C**) and an organic radical ($\text{R}\cdot$). The organic radical adds to the olefin to produce a new organic radical, which reacts with a persistent copper(II) radical (**C**)^{16b,28,29} to afford the three-component coupling product and a copper(I)-halide (**D**). Ligand exchange between complex **D** and trifluoromethylthiolate completes the catalytic cycle and regenerates complex **A**.


Through treatment of CuI first with AgSCF₃ (1.0 equiv) and then with binap (1.0 equiv) in CH₃CN at room temperature, followed by crystallization, we have been able to obtain pale-yellow crystals that we have crystallographically characterized as $[(\text{binap})\text{Cu}(\text{SCF}_3)_2]$ (**1**, Figure 3a).^{22a} In the solid-state, two Cu centers are bridged by trifluoromethylthiolates, with the Cu₂(SCF₃)₂ subunit forming a planar four-membered ring with a C₂ axis along the Cu...Cu vector. The absorption spectrum of complex **1** in acetonitrile shows an absorption

profile with intensity tailing into the region of blue-LED excitation (380–520 nm) (Figure 3b). The excitation and the emission profiles of copper complex **1** are provided in Figure 3c; we have established that ethyl bromodifluoroacetate quenches the luminescence (see the Supporting Information).


Complex **1** can be used in place of CuI and binap as a catalyst for the three-component coupling, affording the product in virtually the same yield as under the standard conditions using 10% CuI/10% binap (eq 2); essentially no coupling is observed in the dark (<1%). Irradiation of copper complex **1** in acetonitrile with ethyl bromodifluoroacetate and allylbenzene provides the thioether product in moderate yield (48%); again, no reaction occurs in the absence of light (eq 3). These observations indicate that complex **1**, or a compound derived from complex **1**, may be an intermediate in the photoinduced, copper-catalyzed three-component coupling.

Irradiation of the model reaction in the absence of CuI does not consume the electrophile, which suggests that the SCF_3 anion itself is not photoreactive under the coupling conditions (see the Supporting Information). Replacing binap with a Ru or Ir photosensitizer affords the three-component coupling product, but in much lower yield (eq 4).³⁰

To test whether a carbocation intermediate might be formed when using an aliphatic olefin substrate, we subjected 4-penten-1-ol to the standard conditions shown in Table 1. The cyclized product expected from a carbocation intermediate was not observed (see SI).



(2)




(3)




(4)

To probe for the release of an organic radical R^\bullet upon photoreduction of the electrophile (bottom of Figure 2), the model reaction was irradiated under the standard conditions, but in the presence of TEMPO. A moderate yield of the TEMPO- R adduct was observed (eq 5), but essentially none of the three-component coupling product. Furthermore, we have performed a radical-clock experiment which indicates that R^\bullet , generated from radical addition of the olefin (Figure 2, bottom), undergoes C-S coupling more slowly than the ring-opening reaction (eq 6). These observations are consistent with the involvement of an organic radical intermediate.




(5)



(6)

In view of our observation that bromide can serve as a nucleophile in photoinduced, copper-catalyzed three-component couplings (Table 5, entry 1), we sought to exclude the possibility that, in the synthesis of thioethers from aliphatic olefins, an alkyl bromide is generated as an intermediate. We therefore irradiated a mixture of an alkyl bromide and NMe_4SCF_3 in the presence of $CuI/binap$ (eq 7). No thioether was observed, indicating that the alkyl bromide is not an intermediate in the synthesis of the thioether (eq 7).



(7)

We have also carried out EPR studies to explore whether a copper(II) species accumulates during a catalyzed three-component coupling. Upon irradiation of the model reaction (Table 1) for 10 minutes at room temperature, only a trace of a copper(II) signal was evident, and the signal had disappeared after 60 minutes of irradiation (see the Supporting Information). Given that the reaction is ~20% complete after 60 minutes, this indicates that copper(II) does not accumulate during the reaction. Curiously, irradiation of the model reaction at $-40\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ for 10 min, conditions under which little coupling product is formed, followed by freeze-quenching at $-198\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, gives rise to a strong EPR signal (see the Supporting Information). This signal shows an unpaired spin coupled to $^{63/65}\text{Cu}$ ($I = 3/2$). The same EPR-active species could be detected by the addition of tris(4-bromophenyl)ammoniumyl hexachloroantimonate (Magic Blue) to CuSCF_3 at $-78\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ in the presence of NMe_4SCF_3 , but in the absence of binap. Hence, this EPR-active species is likely an SCF_3 -ligated copper(II) species (e.g., $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}(\text{SCF}_3)_3^-$ or $\text{Cu}^{\text{II}}(\text{SCF}_3)_4^{2-}$). Its role in the catalytic pathway, if any, remains unclear.

We have previously considered related *tandem* photoredox and bond-forming cycles for photoinduced, copper-catalyzed couplings,^{13e,13f} and we note that such a scenario may be operative in the three-component couplings described herein. It may also be that more than one pathway is viable.

CONCLUSIONS

As schematically outlined at the bottom of Figure 2, we have been interested in expanding our efforts in photoinduced, copper-catalyzed couplings to include three-component couplings of electrophiles, olefins, and nucleophiles, which could provide a powerful approach to the convergent synthesis of functionalized organic compounds; in the present study, we describe our initial progress, specifically, the development of an efficient method for the coupling of activated alkyl halides, olefins, and trifluoromethylthiolate to generate trifluoromethyl thioethers in good yield using a simple catalyst (CuI/binap). The ability to conduct these photoinduced reactions without heating and with blue-LED (rather than 254 nm) irradiation is advantageous relative to related methods. Beyond providing the first example of $\text{Csp}^3\text{--SCF}_3$ bond construction using photoinduced copper catalysis, we have observed that nucleophiles other than thiolate can also be used in the methodology described herein, thereby furnishing C--Br , C--CN , and C--N_3 bonds. This observation points to rich opportunities to exploit photoinduced, copper-catalyzed three-component couplings to generate functionalized products that contain an array of useful C--C and C--heteroatom bonds. Ongoing efforts are directed at exploring the full scope of such processes.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Support has been provided by the National Institutes of Health (National Institute of General Medical Sciences, grant R01-109194). We thank Dr. Tanvi S. Ratani, Dr. Paul H. Oyala (Caltech EPR Facility, supported by NSF-1531940), Larry M. Henling, Dr. Jun Myun Ahn, and Theodore M. Donnell for experimental assistance and for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

- (1). (a)Hansch C; Leo A; Unger SH; Kim KH; Nikaitani D; Lien EJ J. Med. Chem 1973, 16, 1207–1216. [PubMed: 4747963] (b)Hansch C; Leo A; Taft RW Chem. Rev 1991, 91, 165–195. (c)Bégué J-P; Bonnet-Delpon D Bioorganic and Medicinal Chemistry of Fluorine; John Wiley & Sons: Hoboken, NJ, 2008.(d)Landelle G; Panossian A; Leroux F Curr. Top. Med. Chem 2014, 14, 941–951. [PubMed: 24484423]
- (2). (a)Leroux F; Jeschke P; Schlosser M Chem. Rev 2005, 105, 827–856. [PubMed: 15755078] (b)Boiko VN Beilstein J. Org. Chem 2010, 6, 880–921. [PubMed: 20978611] (c)Landelle G; Panossian A; Leroux F Curr. Top. Med. Chem 2014, 14, 941–951. [PubMed: 24484423] (d)Wang J; Sánchez-Roselló M; Aceña JL; del Pozo C; Sorochinsky AE; Fustero S; Soloshonok VA; Liu H Chem. Rev 2014, 114, 2432–2506. [PubMed: 24299176]
- (3). (a)Counts GW; Gregory D; Zeleznik D; Turck M Antimicrob. Agents Chemother 1977, 11, 708–711. [PubMed: 324399] (b)Aswapokee N; Neu HC Antimicrob. Agents Chemother 1979, 15, 444–446. [PubMed: 313753] (c)Houston ME Jr.; Jagt DLV; Honek JF Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett 1991, 1, 623–628.(d)Coombs GH; Mottram JC Antimicrob. Agents Chemother 2001, 45, 1743–1745. [PubMed: 11353620] (e)Tokoro M; Asai T; Kobayashi S; Takeuchi T; Nozaki TJ Biol. Chem 2003, 278, 42717–42727.(f)Sato D; Kobayashi S; Yasui H; Shibata N; Toru T; Yamamoto M; Tokuro G; Ali V; Soga T; Takeuchi T; Suematsu M; Nozaki TJ Antimicrob. Agents 2010, 35, 56–61.(g)Barata-Vallejo S; Bonesi S; Postigo A Org. Biomol. Chem 2016, 14, 7150–7182. [PubMed: 27354317]
- (4). For leading references on C–H trifluoromethylthiolation, see:Tran LD; Popov I; Daugulis OJ Am. Chem. Soc 2012, 134, 18237–18240.Xu C; Shen Q Org. Lett 2014, 16, 2046–2049. [PubMed: 24661053] Chen C; Xu X-H; Yang B; Qing F-L Org. Lett 2014, 16, 3372–3375. [PubMed: 24892973] Guo S; Zhang X; Tang P Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2015, 54, 4065–4069.Wu H; Xiao Z; Wu J; Guo Y; Xiao J-C; Liu C; Chen Q-Y Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2015, 54, 4070–4074.Mukherjee S; Maji B; Tlahuext-Aca A; Glorius FJ Am. Chem. Soc 2016, 138, 16200–16203.
- (5). For examples of radical addition of alkenes to construct C–SCF₃ bonds, see:Harris JF Jr.; Stacey FW J. Am. Chem. Soc 1961, 83, 840–845.Harris JF Jr. J. Am. Chem. Soc 1962, 84, 3148–3153.Harris JF Jr. J. Org. Chem 1966, 31, 931–935.Harris JF Jr. J. Org. Chem 1967, 32, 2063–2074.Harris JF J. Org. Chem 1972, 37, 1340–1346.Yang T; Lu L; Shen Q Chem. Commun 2015, 51, 5479–5481.Li Y; Koike T; Akita M Asian J. Org. Chem 2017, 6, 445–448.Dagousset G; Simon C; Anselmi E; Tuccio B; Billard T; Magnier E Chem. - Eur. J 2017, 23, 4282–4286. [PubMed: 28211967] Fang J; Wang Z-K; Wu S-W; Shen W-G; Ao G-Z; Liu F Chem. Commun 2017, 53, 7638–7641.
- (6). For representative references on the trifluoromethylation of thiols, see:Umemoto T; Ishihara SJ Am. Chem. Soc 1993, 115, 2156–2164.Kieltsch I; Eisenberger P; Togni A Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2007, 46, 754–757.Harsányi A; Dorkó É; Csapó Á; Bakó T; Peltz C; Rábai J J. Fluorine Chem 2011, 132, 1241–1246.
- (7). For examples of electrophilic trifluoromethylthiolation, see:Baert F; Colomb J; Billard T Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2012, 51, 10382–10385.Liu J; Chu L; Qing F-L Org. Lett 2013, 15, 894–897. [PubMed: 23379667] Shao X; Wang X; Yang T; Lu L; Shen Q Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2013, 52, 3457–3460.Alazet S; Zimmer L; Billard T Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2013, 52, 10814–10817.Bootwicha T; Liu X; Pluta R; Atodiresei I; Rueping M Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2013, 52,

12856–12859. Wang X; Yang T; Cheng X; Shen Q *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2013, 52, 12860–12864. Vinogradova EV; Müller P; Buchwald SL *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2014, 53, 3125–3128. Milandou LJC; Carreyre H; Alazet S; Greco G; Martin-Mingot A; Loumpangou CN; Ouamba J-M; Bouazza F; Billard T; Thibaudau S *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2017, 56, 169–172.

- (8). (a) Xu X-H; Matsuzaki K; Shibata N *Chem. Rev* 2015, 115, 731–764. [PubMed: 25121343]
(b) Toulgoat F; Billard T In *Modern Synthesis Processes and Reactivity of Fluorinated Compounds*; Groult H, Leroux F, Tressaud A, Eds.; Elsevier, 2017; pp 141–179.
- (9). (a) Hanack M; Massa FW *Tetrahedron Lett.* 1981, 22, 557–558. (b) Tyrre W; Naumann D; Hoge B; Yagupolskii YL J. *Fluorine Chem* 2003, 119, 101–107. (c) Kong D; Jiang Z; Xin S; Bai Z; Yuan Y; Weng Z *Tetrahedron* 2013, 69, 6046–6050. (d) Lin Q; Chen L; Huang Y; Rong M; Yuan Y; Weng Z *Org. Biomol. Chem* 2014, 12, 5500–5508. [PubMed: 24945877]
- (10). The formation of a C–SCF₃ bond with (and to generate) styrenes has recently been achieved through the use of a stoichiometric amount of LCuSCF₃ (L = bpy or phen). See: Zhang B-S; Gao L-Y; Zhang Z; Wen Y-H; Liang Y-M *Chem. Commun* 2018, 54, 1185–1188. Xiao Z; Liu Y; Zheng L; Liu C; Guo Y; Chen Q-Y J. *Org. Chem* 2018, 83, 5836–5843. [PubMed: 29658711]
- (11). For a recent example on copper-catalyzed intramolecular aminotrifluoromethylthiolation of alkenes with AgSCF₃, see: Guo K; Zhang H; Cao S; Gu C; Zhou H; Li J; Zhu Y *Org. Lett* 2018, 20, 2261–2264. [PubMed: 29583008]
- (12). For couplings with aryl halides, see: Creutz SE; Lotito KJ; Fu GC; Peters JC *Science* 2012, 338, 647–651. [PubMed: 23118186] Uyeda C; Tan Y; Fu GC; Peters JC *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2013, 135, 9548–9552. [PubMed: 23697882] Ziegler DT; Choi J; Muñoz-Molina JM; Bissember AC; Peters JC; Fu GC *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2013, 135, 13107–13112. [PubMed: 23968565]
- (13). For couplings with alkyl halides, see: Bissember AC; Lundgren RJ; Creutz SE; Peters JC; Fu GC *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2013, 52, 5129–5133. Do H-Q; Bachman S; Bissember AC; Peters JC; Fu GC *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2014, 136, 2162–2167. [PubMed: 24446666] Ratani TS; Bachman S; Fu GC; Peters JC *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2015, 137, 13902–13907. [PubMed: 26491957] Kainz QM; Matier CM; Bartoszewicz A; Zultanski SL; Peters JC; Fu GC *Science* 2016, 351, 681–684. [PubMed: 26912852] Matier CD; Schwaben J; Peters JC; Fu GC *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2017, 139, 17707–17710. [PubMed: 29182328] Ahn JM; Peters JC; Fu GC *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2017, 139, 18101–18106. [PubMed: 29200268]
- (14). For a decarboxylative C–N coupling, see: Zhao W; Wurz RP; Peters JC; Fu GC *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2017, 139, 12153–12156. [PubMed: 28841018]
- (15). For leading references on work by other groups, see: Sagadevan A; Hwang KC *Adv. Synth. Catal* 2012, 354, 3421–3427. Paria S; Reiser O *ChemCatChem* 2014, 6, 2477–2483.
- (16). For mechanistic studies, see: Johnson MW; Hannoun KI; Tan Y; Fu GC; Peters JC *Chem. Sci* 2016, 7, 4091–4100. [PubMed: 28044096] Ahn JM; Ratani TS; Hannoun KI; Fu GC; Peters JC *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2017, 139, 12716–12723. [PubMed: 28817770]
- (17). Note that organic radical R• may be generated by an alternative photoreductant in solution (for example, see reference 16b). Additionally, there may be more than one LnCu(II)Nu species that is competent for C–N bond formation upon reaction with R•.
- (18). Matyjaszewski K *Adv. Mater* 2018, 30, Advance Article, DOI: 10.1002/adma.201706441.
- (19). For leading references on copper-catalyzed three-component couplings of alkyl halides under thermal conditions, see: Liao Z; Yi H; Li Z; Fan C; Zhang X; Liu J; Deng Z; Lei A *Chem. - Asian J* 2015, 10, 96–99. [PubMed: 25353376] Gockel SN; Buchanan TL; Hull KL *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2018, 140, 58–61. [PubMed: 29095598]
- (20). For pertinent examples of photochemical three-component couplings of alkyl halides, see: Guo Q; Wang M; Wang Y; Xu Z; Wang R *Chem. Commun* 2017, 53, 12317–12320. Liu H; Guo Q; Chen C; Wang M; Xu Z *Org. Chem. Front* 2018, 5, 1522–1526.
- (21). For examples of thermal couplings using SCF₃– as a nucleophile, see: Teverovskiy G; Surry DS; Buchwald SL *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2011, 50, 7312–7314. Zhang C-P; Vicic DA *J. Am. Chem. Soc* 2012, 134, 183–185. [PubMed: 22148268] Xu J; Mu X; Chen P; Ye J; Liu G *Org. Lett* 2014, 16, 3942–3945. [PubMed: 25036156] Saravanana P; Anbarasan P *Adv. Synth. Catal* 2015, 357, 3521–3528. Yin G; Kalvet I; Englert U; Schoenebeck FJ *Am. Chem. Soc* 2015, 137, 4164–4172. Yin G; Kalvet I; Schoenebeck F *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed* 2015, 54, 6809–6813. Matheis C;

- Wagner V; Goossen LJ Chem. - Eur. J 2016, 22, 79–82. [PubMed: 26482439] Dürr AB; Yin G; Kalvet I; Napoly F; Schoenebeck F Chem. Sci 2016, 7, 1076–1081. [PubMed: 29081943]
- (22). For the trifluoromethylthiolation of aryl halides with copper complexes, see: Weng Z; He W; Chen C; Lee R; Tan D; Lai Z; Kong D; Yuan Y; Huang KW Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2013, 52, 1548–1552. Yang Y; Xu L; Yu S; Liu X; Zhang Y; Vicic DA Chem. - Eur. J 2016, 22, 858–863. [PubMed: 26634641]
- (23). Tsuchii K; Imura M; Kamada N; Hirao T; Ogawa AJ Org. Chem 2004, 69, 6658–6665.
- (24). For representative references of the difunctionalization of olefins with Ir or Ru photocatalysts, see: Nguyen JD; Tucker JW; Konieczynska MD; Stephenson CRJ J. Am. Chem. Soc 2011, 133, 4160–4163. [PubMed: 21381734] Wallentin C-J; Nguyen JD; Finkbeiner P; Stephenson CRJ J. Am. Chem. Soc 2012, 134, 8875–8884. [PubMed: 22486313] Yasu Y; Koike T; Akita M Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2012, 51, 9567–9571. Hari DP; Hering T; König B Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2014, 53, 725–728. Daniel M; Dagousset G; Diter P; Klein P-A; Tuccio B; Goncalves A-M; Masson G; Magnier E Angew. Chem., Int. Ed 2017, 56, 3997–4001.
- (25). For a discussion of this approach see: Collins KD; Glorius F; Nat. Chem 2013, 5, 597–601. [PubMed: 23787750]
- (26). (a) Prier CK; Rankic DA; MacMillan DWC Chem. Rev 2013, 113, 5322–5363. [PubMed: 23509883] (b) Staveness D; Bosque I; Stephenson CRJ Acc. Chem. Res 2016, 49, 2295–2306. [PubMed: 27529484] (c) Ravelli D; Protti S; Fagnoni M Chem. Rev 2016, 116, 9850–9913. [PubMed: 27070820]
- (27). Other mechanistic scenarios, including pathways involving carbocation intermediates and/or radical chain processes, should also be considered and may contribute depending on the substrates used.
- (28). For discussions of persistent radicals, see: Studer A Chem. - Eur. J 2001, 7, 1159–1164. [PubMed: 11322540] Fischer H Chem. Rev 2001, 101, 3581–3610. [PubMed: 11740916]
- (29). (a) Jang ES; McMullin CL; Kaäß M; Meyer K; Cundari TR; Warren TH J. Am. Chem. Soc 2014, 136, 10930–10940. [PubMed: 24940616] (b) Salvador TK; Arnett CH; Kundu S; Sapiezynski NG; Bertke JA; Boroujeni MR; Warren TH J. Am. Chem. Soc 2016, 138, 16580–16583. [PubMed: 27959520]
- (30). Note: If 4-phenylstyrene is used as the olefin in place of allylbenzene, along with 10% Ir(ppy)₃ instead of 10% binap as the additive, an 80% yield of coupled product is obtained. This observation underscores the possibility that different mechanistic pathways may be accessible depending on the substrate.





Figure 1.
Examples of bioactive compounds that contain an alkyl-SCF₃ subunit.

**Figure 2.**

Top: Outline of a possible pathway for photoinduced, copper-catalyzed cross-coupling;

Bottom: Outline of a possible pathway for photoinduced, copper-catalyzed three-component cross-coupling.





Figure 3. (a) Crystal structure of dicopper complex **1** (thermal ellipsoids drawn at 50% probability; hydrogens omitted for clarity). (b) Absorption spectra of complex **1** in CH₃CN at room temperature. (c) Excitation (emission wavelength: 520 nm) and emission (excitation wavelength: 350 nm) spectra in CH₃CN at room temperature.

Table 1.

Photoinduced, Copper-Catalyzed Three-Component Coupling: Effect of Reaction Parameters



entry	change from the "standard conditions"	yield (%) ^a
1	none	82
2	no CuI	<1
3	no binap	<1
4	no $h\nu$	<1
5	no $h\nu$, 80 °C	<1
6	$h\nu$ (350 nm)	52
7	$h\nu$ (300 nm)	49
8	CuBr, instead of CuI	78
9	CuCl, instead of CuI	77
10	CuCl ₂ , instead of CuI	64
11	copper nanoparticle (60–80 nm), instead of CuI	23
12	xantphos, instead of binap	12
13	dppe, instead of binap	3
14	dppf, instead of binap	<1
15	PPh ₃ , instead of binap	4
16	phen, instead of binap	<1
17	10% Ir(ppy) ₃ , instead of CuI and binap	21
18	10% Ru(bpy) ₃ (PF ₆) ₂ , instead of CuI and binap	5
19	5% binap	75
20	5% CuI, 5% binap	66
21	1.2 equiv EtO ₂ CCF ₂ Br, 1.2 equiv NMe ₄ SCF ₃	65
22	under an atmosphere of air, instead of nitrogen	<1
23	0.1 equiv H ₂ O added	72

^aYields were determined via ¹H NMR analysis versus an internal standard (average of two or three experiments).

Table 2.

Scope with Respect to the Olefin

entry	olefin	yield (%) ^a
1		77
2		70
3		65
4		73
5		83
6		90
7		91
8		84
9		85 ^b
10		85
11		98
12		69
13		72 ^c
14		57 ^{de}
15		93 ^f

^aYield of purified product (average of two experiments).

$b_{-10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}, 24\text{ h.}}$

$c_{\text{d.r.}} = 11:1.$








$d_{30\% \text{ Cu}, 30\% \text{ binap.}}$


$e_{\text{d.r.}} > 20:1.$

$f_{\text{d.r.}} = 1:1.$

Table 3.

Scope with Respect to the Alkyl Halide

			
entry	electrophiles	temp. (°C)	yield (%) ^a
1		-40	58
2		-10	78
3		-40	60
4		-10	71 ^{b,c}
5		-10	72 ^{b,d}
6		-10	70 ^e



^b 3.0 equiv of electrophile and NMe₄SCF₃ were used.

 $c_{\text{d.r.}} = 1.3:1.$ $d_{\text{d.r.}} = 1.8:1.$
$$e_{\text{d.r.}} = 1.3:1.$$

Table 4.

Functional-Group Tolerance: Effect of Additives

		see Table 1 additive (1.0 equiv)	
			no additive: 82%
>75% yield of desired product; >95% recovery of additive			
>70% yield of desired product; >70% recovery of additive			
product: 75% additive: 76%	product: 75% additive: 79%	product: 81% additive: 76%	
40–50% yield of desired product; <70% recovery of additive			
product: 46% additive: 68%	product: 47% additive: <5%	product: 45% additive: <5%	

Table 5.

Use of Other Nucleophiles

$ \begin{array}{c} \text{R-X} \quad \text{CH}_2=\text{CH-R}^1 \quad \text{N}(n\text{-Bu})_4\text{Nu} \\ 1.5 \text{ equiv} \quad 1.5 \text{ equiv} \\ \text{X = Br, I} \end{array} \xrightarrow[\text{CH}_3\text{CN, r.t.}]{\begin{array}{c} 10\text{--}20\% \text{ Cul} \\ 10\text{--}20\% \text{ binap} \\ h\nu \text{ (blue LED)} \end{array}} \begin{array}{c} \text{R} \quad \text{Nu} \\ \quad \\ \text{CH}_2-\text{CH}-\text{R}^1 \end{array} $		
entry	coupling product	yield(%) ^a
1 ^b		80
2 ^b		54
3 ^c		65

^aYield of purified product (average of two experiments).^bX = Br.^cX = I.